

DRAFT - IMAC QA Subcommittee Meeting Minutes May 24, 2004

Members Present:, John Haine, DHFS; Lisa Hanson, DHFS; Pam Lohaus, DHFS; Vicki Jessup, DHFS; Rick Zynda, DHFS; Marilyn Rudd, DHFS; Chris Elms, Dane County; Jackie Bennett, Racine County

Via Conference Call: Joanne Ator, Door County; Lorie Mueller, La Crosse County

Members Absent: Bernadette Connolly, DHFS; Marcia Williamson, DHFS; Kathy Judd, Dane County; Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee County

I. April 26, 2004 Minutes

The April minutes were reviewed. Correction made under FS QAP, last sentence. Kathy Judd, **not** Chris Elms, provided the Dane Co 2nd party review form for our review.

II. Continued...APE Discussion at IMAC Meeting:

John Haine presented the QA Subcommittee's Performance Standards Recommendations at the IMAC meeting held May 20, 2004. John did not redo the spreadsheets because he felt that by the time any decision was made they would need to be redone again.

IMAC listened to the proposal and expressed their concerns. It appears it is known that there is a need for equity in sharing penalties and bonuses, but along with this is the concern that the IM allocations have already been drastically reduced. They feel that reducing their funding more will only make it impossible for them to perform their duties, thus providing poor customer service and less accurate benefits.

During the discussion it appeared that the recommendations were to go back to the QA Subcommittee for further evaluation. The QA Subcommittee has presented this proposal to IMAC for the second time. Jackie Bennett proposed that the recommendations go to the next level, the Workload and Finance Committee. (The committee applauded Jackie for this great suggestion!)

Further IMAC discussion included the 2006 budget. They would like to see full funding for all local agencies. One of the prerequisites would be that the county/tribal agencies would need to contribute to this funding. This process will involve quantifying all tasks done at the local agencies followed by a cost benefit analysis.

III. New Pass-through method

The new methodology for determining fiscal liability will reduce future sanction amounts considerably. There will not be a sanction for FFY 03 and we are still in the running for bonus money for most improved payment accuracy, it will depend on what happens with regression for Wisconsin, Illinois, and Connecticut. FNS should be notifying the states sometime in June on who will be receiving bonus money.

If Wisconsin does receive a bonus, John Haine suggested that the money be put away for a possible FFY 04 sanction. Pam Lohaus will address this at the Workload and Finance Committee.

In considering bonus options, if a state agency incurs a liability for the FFY they will not be eligible for bonus money in any of the bonus categories. Wisconsin's estimated error rate for FFY 04 is at 7.5% with a potential liability of \$387,000.00.

In regards to local agency liability, it has been agreed that there must be a cap on the amount an agency could be required to pay for a penalty and that the process for determining an agency's penalty needs to be simplified.

Jackie Bennet came up with a recommended solution. She suggested that we eliminate the APE multiplier and use the percent of APE's in the total error amount as a ratio of the sanction, and the percent of each agency's APE's to the total sanction amount.

The example provided:

Lets say our sanction for FY '04 is \$400,000 and lets say that for FY '04 the % of APEs from the QA reviews is 50%. Then the total amount of any pass-through would be \$200,000. This amount would be divided up among all agencies with APES or among those agencies with a sample of 30 or more cases that had an error rate above either the federal tolerance level or 6%, whichever is higher.

The amount due from each agency will equal each agency's contribution to the APE total. For example, if agency XYZ contributes 10% to the APE total, then agency XYZ will have an obligation for 10% of the \$200,000 liability.

The agency results for FY '04 from October to April thus far -

FY '04 APEs (October - April)		
Agency	APE Error Amount	% of Total
Chippewa	\$40	1%
Columbia	\$41	1%
Dane	\$72	2%
Douglas	\$38	1%
Grant	\$39	1%
Green	\$132	4%
Green Lake	\$48	1%
Kenosha	\$41	1%
Lincoln	\$113	3%
Marquette	\$52	2%
Milwaukee	\$2,515	76%
Racine	\$36	1%
Washington	\$108	3%
Winnebago	\$32	1%
Total	\$3,307	

IV. Continued Discussion of MA review process for QAP and FS 2nd party process for 2004 QAPs:

MA QAP – Mary Moyer and Steve Ploeser are developing a web-site for MA 2nd party reviews. This will be a secure web-site for local agencies to enter their findings on their reviews. This information will automatically go to Mary Moyer for evaluation. It will be set up so that case numbers can only be entered once in order to avoid duplicate reviews. This database will eliminate any paper forms and maintain a history of all entries.

FS QAP – There was discussion of developing a standardized review process for FS 2nd party reviews as well. Jackie Bennett asked if it was possible for the state to pull the cases to be reviewed for the local agencies, as the cases are pulled for MA. This question had been brought up before but no answer was obtained. Marilyn Rudd suggested she take this project to the MEQC workgroup. It was agreed that this would be the next step in the development of a standardized FS review process. The focus for these reviews will be new applications and reviews.

At the previous QA Subcommittee meeting Lisa Hanson had provided two tools for 2nd party reviews that were developed for the Milwaukee Find and Fix process. It was decided that before these tools are shared with other agencies that an evaluation of their effectiveness must be complete. QA is working on a plan to review Find and Fix reviews. This will assist in determining if the tool is effective. The tool will not be shared until this evaluation is complete.

During the discussion of 2nd party reviews, the topic of the Automated Case Directory (ACD) came up. Local agencies are not satisfied with ACD. They state it is not user friendly and does not meet management needs. John Haine and Rick Zynda agreed that they would take these concerns to their next manager's meeting.

V. Our Next Ventures

With the APE issue being sent on to the Workload and Finance Committee it is time for the QA Subcommittee to focus on what our new ventures will be. It was suggested that this be an agenda item for our next meeting. Suggestions included;

- What do we want to do with future QAP's,
- Administrative penalties,
- Etc...

VI. Next Meeting: Monday, June 28th

6. Notetaker: Vickie Jessup